REMARKS

At the outset, the Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. Applicant thanks the Examiner for taking the time to speak with the Applicant's Representative on April 5, 2007, May 17, 2007, and June 27, 2007. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner's time. The substance of these interviews is set forth in the remarks and constitutes a record of these interviews. The Office Action dated May 30, 2007 and the Interview Summary dated July 11, 2007 have been received and their contents carefully reviewed.

Applicant notes that the Examiner did not enter the supplemental amendment filed on May 17, 2007. The present After Final Amendment is responsive to the May 30, 2007 final office action and supersedes the May 17, 2007 supplemental amendment. Accordingly, Applicant requests non-consideration and non-entry of the May 17, 2007 supplemental amendment.

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, and 10 are hereby amended and claims 13-17 are hereby newly added. Claims 11 and 12 are withdrawn per Applicant's Response to Restriction Requirement filed September 19, 2006. Accordingly, claims 1-17 are currently pending. Of those, claims 11-12 are withdrawn from consideration. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims in light of the following are respectfully requested.

At the outset, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of the first office action. See Office Action at ¶ 1.

Applicant has reviewed and considered the Office's response to Applicant's arguments as set forth in paragraphs 2-6 of the final office action. Applicant thanks the Examiner for his response, nonetheless, Applicant does not agree with the Examiner's comments. In light of the following, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

The Office rejected claims 7 & 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Office alleges that the newly added language "approximately," improperly broadens the scope of the ranges set forth in those claims. See *Office Action at ¶¶ 7-8.* Applicant does not agree with the Office's

assertion, nonetheless, in an effort to advance this application toward allowance, Applicant has amended claims 7 and 10, and respectfully requests that the withdrawal the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejection of those claims.

The Office rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,647,231 to *Payne et al.* (hereinafter "*Payne*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, "the reference must teach every element of the claim." Applicant respectfully submits that *Payne* does not teach every element recited in claims 1-9 and therefore cannot anticipate these claims. More specifically, claim 1 recites a method of controlling a washing machine which includes, among other elements, "displaying default parameters of the course selected in said selecting step" and "selecting the memory function a first time, wherein the selection of the memory function clears the displayed default parameters and displays the customized parameters corresponding to the selected course in said first selecting step." *Payne* fails to disclose at least these features.

The Office alleges that *Payne* teaches "a washing machine having a memory for storing default washing parameters and customizing the washing parameters via input means for selectively performing washing programs." Office Action at ¶ 10. Whether or not this is true, *Payne* fails to disclose "displaying default parameters of the course selected in said selecting step" and "selecting the memory function a first time, wherein the selection of the memory function clears the displayed default parameters and displays the customized parameters corresponding to the selected course in said first selecting step."

As discussed during the April 15, 2007 interview with the Examiner, Applicant's Representative pointed out that *Payne* did not teach or suggest "displaying default parameters of the course selected in said selecting step." The Examiner argued that *Payne* disclosed updating a display in step 106, thus *Payne* was considered to teach "displaying default parameters of the course selected in said selecting step." Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Payne discloses updating "an associated user display (not shown) to indicate the status of the machine." *See Payne* at column 9, lines 5-8. Displaying the status of the machine is not the same as "displaying default parameters of the course selected in said selecting step," as claimed in claim 1. Thus, *Payne* fails to disclose every feature required by claim 1.

In addition, since *Payne* does not disclose "displaying default parameters," *Payne* cannot possibly teach "selecting the memory function a first time, wherein the selection of the memory function clears the displayed default parameters and displays the customized parameters corresponding to the selected course in said first selecting step," as further claimed in claim 1.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over *Payne*, and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 2-9, which depend from claim 1 are also patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1-9.

The Office rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Payne* in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0163440 to *Tsui (hereinafter "Tsui").* Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to "establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." Applicant submits that neither *Payne* nor *Tsui* teach or suggest each and every element recited in claim 10. As previously discussed, *Payne* does not disclose all the features recited in claim 1, the base claim from which claim 10 depends. Moreover, *Tsui* does not address the shortcomings of *Payne*. In fact, *Tsui* is only relied upon to teach that "it is known to press and hold a controller button in an appliance control system to store desired parameters in a memory." Office Action at page. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 10 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references and requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 10.

Likewise, neither *Payne* nor *Tsui* teach or suggest every feature recited in newly added claims 13-17.

The application is in condition for allowance. Early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: August 13, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael J. Wright (Reg. No. 46,522)
for **Mark R. Kresloff**
Registration No.: 42,766
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant